

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

TANISHA HOLLIS, #391365,

Petitioner,

v.

CASE NO. 2:11-CV-14087
HONORABLE PAUL D. BORMAN

MILlicent WARREN,

Respondent.

/

**OPINION AND ORDER DISMISSING THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF
HABEAS CORPUS AND DENYING A CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY**

The Court has before it Tanisha Hollis's *pro se* petition for a writ of habeas corpus filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Petitioner is a state prisoner currently confined at the Huron Valley Women's Correctional Facility in Ypsilanti, Michigan. Petitioner did not pay the required filing fee when she filed her petition, nor did she submit an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. See 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a); 28 U.S.C. § 1915; Rule 3 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases. The Court, therefore, issued an Order to Correct Deficiency on September 27, 2011 requiring Petitioner to either pay the filing fee or submit a properly completed *in forma pauperis* application. The order provided that if Petitioner did not submit the fee or requested information within 21 days, her case would be dismissed.

The time for submitting the filing fee or required information has elapsed and Petitioner has failed to correct the deficiency. Accordingly, the Court **DISMISSES WITHOUT PREJUDICE** the petition for a writ of habeas corpus. Petitioner may submit a new habeas petition with payment

of the filing fee or an *in forma pauperis* application. The Court makes no determination as to the merits of Petitioner's claims.

Before Petitioner may appeal the Court's decision, a certificate of appealability must issue. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(a); Fed. R. App. P. 22(b). A certificate of appealability may issue "only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). When a federal court denies relief on procedural grounds without addressing the merits of a habeas petition, a certificate of appealability should issue if it is shown that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petitioner states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right and that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling. *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484-85 (2000). Reasonable jurists could not debate the correctness of the Court's procedural ruling. Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** a certificate of appealability.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



PAUL D. BORMAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

DATED: 11-14-11